



Annual Report

The Sedgwick County Reentry Program

Participant Involvement and Outcomes July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007

Prepared by:

Margaret Severson*
Associate Professor and Principal Investigator
School of Social Welfare
The University of Kansas

March 31, 2008

* Please address all comments and questions to the author, Margaret Severson, 1545 Lilac Lane; 120 Twente Hall, Lawrence, Kansas 66044 or mseverson@ku.edu

Special thanks to the many people and organizations for continuing to make the Sedgwick County Reentry Project a reality!

The evaluation team at the University of Kansas, School of Social Welfare, is acknowledged and includes:

Chris Veeh, MSW
Data Management

Marianne Berry, Ph.D.
Data Analyst

Kim Bruns, MS.Ed
Justice and Reentry Projects Coordinator

Sarah Potter, CPA
Grants Administrator

Kansas Department of Corrections
Roger Werholtz, Secretary
Margie Phelps, Director of Release Planning

Sedgwick County Reentry Program Administrators and Staff
Sally Frey, Sedgwick County Reentry Program Director
Kameelah Alexander, Program Specialist
Rita Balderes, Case Manager
Curtis Cline, Business & Job Developer
Anne Duncan, Reentry Housing Specialist (Wichita Housing & Community Services Dept)
Gabriella Durham, Reentry Administrative Specialist
Saundra Haas, Program Coordinator
Jesse Howes, Lead Case Manager
Dave King, Job Specialist
Brianna Morphis, Case Manager
Courtney Pierce, Police Liaison Officer (Wichita Police Department)
Wesley Roberts, Cognitive Specialist
H. Gloria Rodriguez, Reentry Substance Abuse Care Coordinator (SACK/RADAC)
Justin Shurtz, Reentry Substance Abuse Care Coordinator (SACK/RADAC)

Introduction

The Conception and Development of the Sedgwick County Reentry Project

In February, 2002, the *Wichita Assembly Community Reconnection – A New Beginning for Offenders* forum convened at Wichita State University. The Assembly was co-sponsored by the City of Wichita, Sedgwick County and the Kansas Department of Corrections (KDOC). The intent of the assembly was to bring together a group of community stakeholders, interested in both public safety and the successful reintegration of incarcerated individuals, to discuss the critical issues of offender reentry.

At the conclusion of the Wichita Assembly, a Reentry Taskforce was developed to study and consider the elements necessary to build a successful prison reentry program in Sedgwick County. The Reentry Taskforce eventually published their recommendations for a reentry program in February 2004. These recommendations laid the initial groundwork for the Sedgwick County Reentry Program (*SgCRP*).

With the Reentry Taskforce's recommendations guiding the development of the new reentry program, Sedgwick County officials agreed to contribute to the development of the Sedgwick County Reentry Program by funding one-third of the cost; the remainder was underwritten with state general funds. The city of Wichita also made a substantial investment in the *SgCRP* through in-kind contributions. The *SgCRP* officially began providing reintegration services to KDOC inmates in early 2006.

Mission Statement

The mission statement of the Sedgwick County Reentry Program includes the following language:

“...to provide Kansas offenders the tools necessary to ensure a successful reentry into the community ... by identifying the criminogenic risk and needs of high-risk offenders, and

addressing them through a comprehensive release plan. We will promote pro-social cognitive processes with program participants; improve opportunities for permanent and stable housing; improve opportunities for pre-release treatment and mental health assessment; post-release access to services; and improve the rate of employment. We strive to achieve this through effective networking with community resources, entities within the Kansas Department of Corrections and family involvement.”

Criteria for Participation

Target project population: The target population for the *SgCRP* includes male and female offenders incarcerated in a Kansas Department of Corrections’ prison and who are scheduled or who plan to return to Sedgwick County. There are no age restrictions on individuals eligible for participation in the *SgCRP*. Participants must have between 12 to 18 months left to serve in prison and be identified as posing a high risk to the community for recidivist behavior. Each involved offender’s risk level is determined through the use of a dynamic risk / need assessment tool, the Level of Service Inventory-Revised (LSI-R). Inmates who are scheduled for post release supervision and those who will be released without continuing supervision are eligible for involvement in the *SgCRP*; thus, offenders leaving the prison may elect to participate in the program even though they are not subject to post-release supervision.

Potential participants who may be returning to Sedgwick County are identified using a computer search of release dates and counties from which they were sentenced to the KDOC. The LSI-R scores are also reviewed and, during the period analyzed in this report (July 1, 2006 - June 30, 2007) persons with a composite score of 30 or higher were deemed eligible for participation in the *SgCRP*.¹ The LSI-R composite score of 30 or higher was used as one of the *SgCRP*’s threshold admission criteria unless other qualifying variables suggested an individual’s circumstances made him or her a priority for *SgCRP* participation, i.e. sex offender status or repeat returns to prison.

¹ The minimum threshold LSI-R score for acceptance into the program is now set at 30, unless exceptional circumstances allow for a waiver.

Project Design

The *SgCRP* is designed as a three-phase program, starting while the inmate is incarcerated and continuing through his/her release and reintegration into the community. The program focus, however, is largely centered on Phases One and Two; though through the mechanisms of the accountability panels and the alumni services, participants are exposed to the availability of long term supports even after program completion.

Phase I: Pre-Release Planning. Phase one of the *SgCRP* includes reentry pre-release assessments and programming provided at the El Dorado (EDCF), Winfield (WCF), Wichita Work Release (WWRF), Hutchinson (HCF) (adult male), and Topeka (TCF) (adult female) Correctional Facilities. Participants are enrolled (voluntarily) in the program 12 to 18 months in advance of their scheduled release dates. Every program participant is assigned a case manager immediately upon acceptance into the program.

Unique to the Sedgwick County Reentry Program is the task of executing an effective reentry program for multiple prison facilities. The *SgCRP* staff must coordinate their work with *SgCRP* participants who are geographically spread out amongst the various prison facilities, making it more challenging to ensure uniform availability of program services and staff to all *SgCRP* participants.

Once enrolled in the *SgCRP*, the reentry coordinator and other reentry staff, in conjunction with the offender, work to design a reintegration regime that corresponds to the inmate's criminogenic risks (as defined by scores on the LSI-R). While difficult to accomplish for every participant, most inmate participants have been offered the opportunity to engage in educational programs, substance abuse and mental health treatment, and job training.

There are several specific and intensive courses offered to participants, including employment readiness and development; cognitive classes (*Thinking for a Change* or *New Directions* curricula); family relations; money management; substance abuse and relapse prevention education; housing plans; and reentry planning.

Phase II: Release Planning and Reintegration. Phase Two of the *SgCRP* involves identifying the appropriate resources to which the participants can be referred for services upon their release. This phase has two primary purposes. First, it is to develop a continuum of service provision that follows the offender from the institution into the community and then offers offenders the support and the necessary opportunities to succeed. The second purpose is to develop a reentry plan that bridges between the institution and the community; one that is continually updated during the participant's tenure in the program and/or during the time the participant is under criminal justice supervision. During this phase the offender's release plan is established, and s/he meets with the police officer liaison, the parole officer, and the case manager prior to his or her release.

The same case manager who has been working with the participant while s/he is incarcerated continues to work with the participant once s/he is in the community. After release, every participant meets with his/her Accountability Panel – a panel of community representatives who come together to review the participant's reentry plan and to support the participant's progress in the *SgCRP*. The participant may ask his/her family, friends and other supports to attend the Accountability Panel meetings to participate in the process and interact, though they are not formal members of the Panel.

Throughout the six month period of official reentry programming that occurs during Phase Two, the participant's case manager, his/her parole officer (if on post-release supervision),

the police officer liaison, and the accountability panel work closely together to provide effective, safe, and supportive supervision of the participant. Moreover, the participant is directed to intensive job services, community services, mentoring, and support programs as needed.

In Sedgwick County, one staff member working not only with the reentry office but also working on a broader scale with parole and probation officers, has as his responsibility the development of relationships in the business community. He makes presentations to various service groups such as the Kiwanis Club and the Chamber of Commerce and has met individually with community and private business employers. He has also interfaced with reentry participants to help them think about their options for employment and to “teach” them appropriate skills that can be used to secure employment and works to place offenders into KDOC specialty employment programs such as apprenticeships. While it is impossible to link his work directly to specific participant job outcomes, on a macro level of reentry activity, other KDOC personnel believe that his efforts are impacting the perceptions of business managers in the community and are helping to reduce the stigma associated with hiring an ex-offender.

Finally, in Sedgwick County an employee of the Wichita Housing & Community Services Department works with the reentry case managers to locate safe and affordable housing in Sedgwick County for reentry participants who may otherwise be homeless upon release from prison. She helped to develop a statewide curriculum on tenant and landlord responsibilities which is delivered to both correctional staff and offenders. This housing specialist networks with housing agencies and private landlords in Sedgwick County to forge relationships and to locate and secure resources that will benefit both the community and the reentry participant.

Phase III: Community Based Long Term Supports. Phase Three of the *SgCRP* will focus on supporting the offender’s crime-free life in the community, lived as a responsible and

productive citizen. Although few participants had graduated from the *SgCRP* as of July 1, 2007, it is anticipated that over time, long-term supports will be established and linkages to community, educational, and other naturally occurring resources will be secured.

Program Staffing

Staffing patterns for the Sedgwick County Reentry Program are based on the Reentry Taskforce recommendations as well as on the structure of the Shawnee County Reentry Program. The following positions are allocated to the *SgCRP*: one program director; three case managers; one facility based reentry coordinator; a program specialist who focuses on the recruitment of volunteers, victim-related and community-service programming and the involvement of the participant's family; an administrative specialist; one police officer liaison (an employee of the city of Wichita); one cognitive specialist; one employment specialist; one business developer; one housing specialist (an employee of the City of Wichita); and one-and-one-half (1½) substance abuse specialists / counselors (employees of Substance Abuse Counseling of Kansas (SACK)).

The Program Evaluation

In accord with the mandates of the Kansas Department of Corrections, a data collection system has been designed that will yield information about relationships between certain defined participant and program elements and ultimate outcomes, including three measures of recidivism – parole violations, new charges and readmissions to prison.

Every participant is expected to sign a program agreement and an informed consent statement prior to his/her enrollment in the *SgCRP*. Participants are aware that data will be collected while they are active in the program and that they are asked to complete periodic

satisfaction surveys designed to provide information about their perceptions of their experiences in the *SgCRP*.

The *SgCRP* Administrative Specialist is responsible for and has been trained to input the data about each participant. The information itself is maintained in the participant's reentry record and documented by his/her case manager or by other staff who have contact with the participant.

The data used for some of these analyses were provided to the University of Kansas evaluation team by the KDOC at various times between July 1, 2007 and September 30, 2007 and clarification on some data was received and incorporated since that time as well. Because outcome data are collected at 6, 12, 18 and 24 months after a participant's release from prison, over time, outcome data on all of the participants in the *SgCRP* will be reported. However, as of July 1, 2007, only two *SgCRP* participants had been released into and living in the community for six months, thus, in this report there are no recidivism outcomes to report.

Periodic data reviews and data analysis continue at regular intervals in order to verify the accuracy of the data and to report on the progress of the Sedgwick County Reentry Program and its participants.

Analysis and Findings

The analysis detailed in the following pages will focus in part on describing the participants enrolled and the services provided in both of the formal reentry programs currently in operation in Kansas and in part solely on the *SgCRP* participants. Because these are two different programs – staff, program offerings, services in the community, and time in operation all differ between them – they are in many ways incomparable. On the other hand, it seems important to see the Kansas reentry initiative both in whole and in part; consequently, this

analysis provides a birds-eye view of the activities of the reentry programs and then a more detailed view of the *SgCRP*. This analysis does not compare the Sedgwick and Shawnee County programs; therefore, no statistical tests of variance were performed.

Certain analytic decisions were necessary prior to generating these statistical data and findings. First, we use the earliest start dates recorded for program participation. Several participants in both programs are on their second or third reentry program experiences. While we believe and the research supports that multiple exposures to reentry programming are likely to occur as part of the natural course of relapse and recovery, and are good for the participant, there are not yet sufficient numbers of participants who have had multiple exposures to reentry programming to allow us to analyze their activities and outcomes outside of the one-exposure group. Over time we expect to be able to separate these people out and consequently to be able to provide more information about the impact of program dosage (how often one receives an intervention) and duration (how long the intervention is provided) on the targeted outcomes.

Second, two participants in the Shawnee program died prior to program completion. Because both of these participants ended their program participation prior to their deaths (one graduated and the other terminated from the program while involved in the community portion of it), they are included in the descriptive statistics and in certain correlation analyses.

Third, when creating the four categories denoting level of program participation certain judgments were required. In many cases, only “end” dates (as opposed to graduation dates) were provided by the program staff. However, a review of the data on each participant with an end date made it clear that the participant had achieved a certain level of participation in the reentry program. Our standards for determining, where necessary, the level of achievement for participants with end dates are explained in the analysis / findings section of this report.

Finally, the data reported here are taken from a variety of sources including police reports, progress reports from community organizations, class completion certificates, participant self-reports, participants' case files, and / or chronological notes made by the case manager in the Total Offender Activity Documentation System (TOADS).

Research staff developed and trained case management staff on the computer databases used to track all participant and program information. These data are entered by a number of individuals, and therefore require careful scrutiny. Data in this database were checked repeatedly for their congruence with case files and other information from KDOC, prior to and during data analysis. However, given the low numbers of responses to some questions, there are concerns about the reliability of some of the data. These will be noted throughout the analysis, but raise questions as to the veracity and/or accuracy of the data.

Demographic, Family and Mental Health Characteristics of Program Participants

There are 170 program participants included in the evaluation of the Sedgwick County program. Overall, program participants at both reentry sites ranged in age from 19 to the mid-60s. The mean age of the participants was in the thirties. Roughly two-thirds to three-quarters of program participants were male, with fewer women enrolled in the *SgCRP* than in the Shawnee County program. About half of program participants were white, and half were African American. The majority of participants said that they did not have a significant other (spouse or intimate partner) at program entry, but did have children. The mean number of children per participant, among those with children, was two children for those in the *SgCRP* and three children for those in the Shawnee program.

One-third of the participants in the *SCRIP* report having child support obligations; fewer in Sedgwick County reported the same. Very small proportions of the program groups reported

having a history of either perpetrating or being a victim of domestic violence. These low rates of child support obligations and domestic violence histories raise concerns (for us and for program staff) about the reliability of these data.

About half of the program participants were reported to need time-limited mental health services while incarcerated. Smaller proportions were said to need ongoing mental health services and/or medications, special needs mental health treatment or mental health reintegration services at the Larned Mental Health Correctional Facility or the Lansing Correctional Facility – Treatment Unit (LCF-TRU).

Table 1: Demographic, Family and Mental Health Characteristics of Program Participants

	Sedgwick County (n=170)	Shawnee County (n=141)
Mean age in 2007	37.1 yrs.	34.5 yrs.
Median age	37.3 yrs.	33.4 yrs.
Range of ages	19 to 62 yrs.	22 to 66 yrs.
	%	%
Gender		
Male	79%	69%
Female	21%	31%
Ethnicity		
White	49%	45%
African American	48%	52%
Native American	1%	1%
Hispanic ²	1%	1%
Asian American	0	1%
Multiracial	1%	0%
At Program Entry		
Has significant other	30%	36%
Has children	54%	73%
Mean number of children *	1 child	2 children
Mean number of children, parents only	2 children	3 children
Has Existing Child Support Obligation³	14%	34%
History of Domestic Violence	4%	11%
Mental Health Code at KDOC Entry		
Not currently requiring MH services	0	0
May require time-limited MH services	49%	49%
Requires ongoing MH services +/- meds	14%	18%
Requires special needs treatment	18%	18%
Requires MH reintegration at LCF-TRU	19%	13%
Requires Intensive Srvcs. Larned/Lansing	1%	2%

* Calculation of mean among total sample, including those without children.

² The KDOC does not separate persons of Hispanic ethnicity from those listed as White. This data element is based on self-report to the reentry program staff. Consequently, the actual percentages of Hispanic reentry participants are probably higher.

³ The child support information for Sedgwick participants is thought to reflect underreporting of data.

Criminogenic Characteristics of Participants at Program Entry

About two-thirds of all program participants had at least one conviction for a violent crime. The majority of those with this history had either one or two violent crime convictions.

The average length of current sentence was approximately 5.5 years in each program. The median length of sentence is a more appropriate reflection of sentences for these populations, because the mean length of sentence is inflated by the very few participants with a life sentence. The median length of the current sentence is about four years, meaning that half of program participants had shorter sentences than four years, and half had longer sentences.

We calculated the LSI-R composite and domain scores at or near program entry for all participants. The LSI-R can be and is administered several times over the course of an inmate's sentence. To reflect the level of criminogenic risk in this sample prior to program participation, we selected the LSI-R score for each individual that was prior to and closest to the date they began the Reentry program.

For the time period of July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007, the composite scores of 31 for the Sedgwick and 26 for the Shawnee County programs on the LSI-R were determined to represent high and medium high risk levels, respectively. Overall, the domains with the highest scores are criminal history, education/employment, and alcohol / drug use. LSI-R domain scores are roughly comparable between Sedgwick and Shawnee County participants.

Table 2: Criminogenic Characteristics of Participants at Program Entry

	Sedgwick County (n=170)	Shawnee County (n=141)
Mean Number of Violent Convictions	1 conviction	1 conviction
Number of Violent Convictions		
None	39%	32%
One	28%	26%
Two	18%	25%
Three	10%	7%
Four or more	5%	10%
Mean Number of Months of Sentence	67.8 mos.	65.3 mos.
Median Number of Months of Sentence	46.5 mos.	50.0 mos.
Number of Months of Sentence		
1 to 11	0	3%
12 to 23	1%	6%
24 to 35	27%	26%
36 to 47	24%	13%
48 to 59	15%	21%
60 to 71	13%	10%
72 to 720	20%	20%
Life sentence	1%	1%
Mean LSIR Scores at/near Prog. Entry †	(n=170)	(n=52)*
Composite	31	26
Education / Employment	7	6
Criminal History	7	7
Alcohol / Drug	4	3
Companions	3	3
Attitude / Orientation	3	1
Family / Marital	2	2
Emotional	2	2
Leisure	2	1
Financial	1	1
Accommodation	1	1

† We have included only those participants who have LSI-R scores administered between 18 months prior to their program start date and 1 year post-start date, and have used the LSI-R score from the assessment closest to their program start date, and prior to their release date.

* A reentry program has been in operation in Shawnee County since 2003, and the participants in that program have had multiple assessments on the LSI-R. When we established the criteria above for selection of participants' LSI-R score, the pool of valid LSI-R scores "at or near program entry" was reduced to those for 52 Shawnee County participants whose dates of LSI-R assessment fell within those time boundaries.

Program Entry and Departure

The Sedgwick County program began accepting participants in early 2006; the Shawnee County Reentry program began doing so in the last half of 2003. It should be noted that most of the 66 participants who were the subjects of the first Shawnee County report are not included in this quantitative analysis. Those who were still active in the program as of July 1, 2006 and those who have had a new program experience are included in this analysis.⁴ Consequently, when looking at the total number of participants served, the Shawnee County population (n=141) appears to include fewer people than does the Sedgwick County program (n=170), but that is only because of the population groups being reported on here.

In the *SCRIP*, there are 65 participants (46%) with a recorded date for ending participation in the program. Among those who have ended the program, the average length of time in the program is 469 days or roughly 15 months. Approximately 37% of those who ended the program had spent more than 18 months in the program. At this time, there are insufficient data that prevent a similar analysis on Sedgwick participants.

⁴ For information about these 66 original participants, see the reports referenced in footnote #1.

Table 3: Program Entry and Departure

	Sedgwick County (n=170)	Shawnee County (n=141)	Shawnee Co. with Release Date and Program End Date (n=54)
Started in Program*			
July-Dec 2003	0	1%	2%
Jan-June 2004	0	1%	2%
July-Dec 2004	0	5%	11%
Jan-June 2005	0	21%	43%
July-Dec 2005	0	18%	26%
Jan-June 2006	24%	15%	11%
July-Dec 2006	43%	21%	4%
Jan-June 2007	34%	18%	1%
Days in Program Prior to Release **	Unavailable	(n=79)	(n=54)
Mean		395 days	378 days
Less than 90 days		0	0
91 to 180 days		8%	11%
181 to 365 days		32%	33%
366 to 545 days		48%	41%
546 to 730 days		10%	13%
731 to 811 days		1%	2%
812 + days		1%	0
Total Days in Program ***		(n=65)	(n=54)
Mean		469 days	507 days
Less than 90 days		9%	7%
91 to 180 days		9%	6%
181 to 365 days		15%	15%
366 to 545 days		25%	26%
546 to 730 days		26%	31%
731 to 811 days		11%	11%
812 + days		5%	6%

* There are 12 inmates who participated in the program multiple times (eleven did the program two times, and one did the program three times).

** Days between program start date and date of release from facility; calculated for those inmates with a recorded "release date." There are currently insufficient data for Sedgwick participants to allow for computation.

*** Days between program start date and program end date; calculated for those inmates with a recorded "program end date."

Program Participation in the Sedgwick County Reentry Program

There is a range of services available to program participants and service type and provision varies by the respective county reentry program. Consequently, program participation data are discussed below. We report here the proportions of participants in the *SgCRP* who: (1) have participated in and completed the service, (2) started the service but quit before completion, (3) were referred to the service but did not attend, and (4) are currently participating in the service (as of July 1, 2007).

Service completion rates are higher than rates for those who started and quit the service or were referred to a service but did not attend. In other words, it appears that participants who begin a service are likely to complete it.

In the *SgCRP*, an assessment for substance abuse was the only service used by more than one-half of all participants. An assessment for mental health service needs was very rarely completed. A reassessment for mental health service needs is done for purposes of reentry planning only if the participant has been previously identified and assigned a code which suggests s/he has significant mental health needs.

The *SgCRP* reentry classes with the highest participation and completion rates focus on employment (31%), money management (24%), substance abuse (23%), and cognitive thinking (20%). Smaller proportions of participants completed the housing workshop (15%) or reentry planning class (36% - but this class was given to *SgCRP* women participants only). Rates for those participants who started and quit a class were highest for cognitive thinking (9%). Non-completion rates were very low for all other classes or workshops.

Only two participants in the *SgCRP* were reported to have used faith-based services.

Table 4: **Program Participation, Sedgwick County Only (n=170) ***

	Completed	Started, Quit	Referred, did not attend	In Process
	%	%	%	%
Assessments				
Substance Abuse Assessment	58%			0.6%
Mental Health Assessment	2%			0.6%
Classes				
Employment Class	31%	3%	0.6%	1%
Money Management	24%	2%	1%	
Substance Abuse Class	23%	1%		
Cognitive Class**	20%	9%	2%	4%
Family Transition Class	8%			
Education GED	7%			5%
Workshops				
Housing Workshop	15%		0.6%	
Leisure Planning Work Packet	3%	1%		
Miscellaneous				
Miscellaneous	11%			
VoTech	6%			
Among Women Only (n=22 responses)				
Release Planning Class	36%	8%	3%	14%

* Raw numbers for program completion must total at least 5 participants for class/service to be included in table. Only two participants in the *SgCRP* were reported to have used faith-based services.

** In Sedgwick County during some periods between July 1, 2006 and June 30, 2007, two cognitive curricula were offered. The “started, quit” data may apply primarily to males enrolled in the course *New Directions*.

Program Participation Preparing for Release to Community

This section discusses participant use of reentry services that are typically provided prior to release from prison. In some cases, such as matching participants to community connectors, the service could have actually occurred post-release. Our data files do not include the date that each of these services was provided; they are grouped in this table as those typically assessed or provided prior to release.

In the *SgCRP*, almost all participants were reported to have signed the program agreement prior to program participation. Almost all participants (89%) had an individual reentry plan completed, but only one participant (1%) had a safety plan reported in their individual reentry plan. Safety plans are not expected to be included in every reentry plan.

Very few participants were matched to a community connector: two percent were matched, and one percent were both referred and matched to a community connector. Sixteen percent were referred to a community connector, but did not have a match. The largest proportion of participants had no action listed regarding community connectors.

In the *SgCRP*, nearly 40 percent of all participants were released from the El Dorado prison facility. Smaller proportions were released from facilities in Topeka (21%), Wichita Work Release (12%), or Winfield (10%).

Case managers were asked to indicate whether program participants would have a variety of assets and supports at their release. Fewer than one-quarter of program participants were reported to have any one of these assets or supports. The most commonly indicated assets were a birth certificate (24%) or identification (12%). Means of transportation once released were seldom reported for program participants in the *SgCRP*.

Few participants in the *SgCRP* were reported to have social supports upon release to the community. The most common support indicated was family support (14%), reported for very few participants.

Table 5: Program Participation Preparing for Release to Community

	Sedgwick County (n=170)	
	%	Raw #
Signed Program Agreement	100%	169
Had Individual Reentry Plan	89%	152
Individual Plan contains a Safety Plan	1%	1
Matched to Community Connector		
Referred and matched	1%	2
Referred only	16%	27
Matched only	2%	3
Not needed	18%	31
No information at this time	63%	107
Released from Facility:		
El Dorado	42%	61
Topeka (females only)	21%	25
Wichita Work Release	12%	20
Winfield	10%	16
Lansing	6%	10
Hutchinson	6%	9
Osawatomie	2%	3
Unspecified	15%	26
At Release to Community:		
Has Birth Certificate	24%	40
Has ID	12%	21
Car	5%	9
Walking	5%	8
Public bus	4%	7
Bicycle	1%	2
Carpool	1%	1
Has Support upon Release from:		
Family	14%	24
AA/NA	3%	5
Spouse	1%	2
Church	1%	2
Community Mental Health Center	1%	2
Community Support Group	1%	2
None	1%	2

Program Participation During Release to Community

Case managers kept track of the contacts that program participants had with program personnel during or related to the community portion of the program. These contacts include Transition Team meetings, which are done prior to release, in preparation for release. We include them in this discussion of the community portion of the reentry programs, because they are meaningful only to those participants who have been released. In addition to information about meeting with Transition Teams, program personnel recorded whether participants met with Accountability Panels, Police Liaison Officers, and Law Enforcement Officers, and for what reasons. In this analysis of community participation, we report only on those individuals who have been released to the community.

The majority of released participants met with a Transition Team at least once. In Sedgwick County, the Team meeting held six months prior to expected release was the most commonly attended. In Shawnee County, almost equal numbers of participants had a Transition Team meeting held six months and 30 days prior to expected release. Sedgwick County also holds Transition Team meetings 90 days after signing the program agreement, and over half of released participants attended this meeting. There is no 90-day Transition Team meeting in Shawnee County.

The program also provides for Accountability Panels that consist of community representatives who come together with the participant to review the participant's reentry plan and to support his / her progress in the reentry program. Appearance in front of the panel may also be used as a sanction for a participant who is struggling. In that event, the panel meets with the participant and then recommends certain time-limited goals that the participant must achieve if s/he is to avoid more serious consequences. Sedgwick County participants are most likely to

have met with an Accountability Panel for their initial contact at release (30%), but rarely at any other time, though this is to be expected since so few were in the community as of July 1, 2007. In Shawnee County, over half of released participants met with an Accountability Panel upon release (60%), and many also attended a panel for risky behavior (28%) and/or for program graduation (28%). Meeting with an Accountability Panel to discuss the success of the program participant occurred for one Shawnee County participant.

The records for these programs also indicate whether participants met with their Police Officer Liaison, and for what purpose. In these records, Transition Team meetings can again be noted, but from the perspective of whether the Police Officer Liaison was involved in the meeting. The most common contact between the Police Officer Liaison and program participants was at the Transition Team meeting held six months prior to expected release (56% in Shawnee County; 52% in Sedgwick County).

In Sedgwick County, also fairly common were contacts with the Police Officer Liaison of a non-criminal nature (44%) and in the Transition Team meeting 30 days prior to expected release (30%). Other contacts, including the initial contact between the Police Officer Liaison and program participant were noted for fewer than 20 percent of released participants. Given that such meetings are strongly encouraged, it seems plausible that many of these contacts occurred but were not entered into the database.

Program personnel were also asked to note the occurrence of any contacts between law enforcement officers (LEOs) and program participants. These contacts were seldom noted in Sedgwick County, again a possible artifact of the few persons in the community on July 1, 2007. In Shawnee County, about one-quarter of released program participants (24%) had been in contact with a law enforcement officer for a misdemeanor charge or an unspecified reason

(21%). Also noted for some participants were contacts with law enforcement officers for traffic violations (17%) or parole violations (16%). Few arrest warrants were noted in the database.

Table 6: Program Participation During Release to Community

	Sedgwick County (n=23)		Shawnee County (n= 75) *	
	%	Raw #	%	Raw #
Transition Team Meetings				
Met six months prior to expected release	78%	18	63%	47
Met 90 days prior to expected release	57%	13	NA	NA
Met 30 days prior to expected release	30%	7	64%	48
Accountability Panels				
Initial Release Panel	30%	7	60%	48
Risky Behavior	9%	2	28%	21
Graduation	9%	2	28%	21
Success	0	0	1%	1
Police Liaison Officer Contacts				
Six month Transition Team	52%	12	56%	44
Non-Criminal	44%	10	17%	13
30 day Transition Team	30%	7	52%	39
Initial Contact	17%	4	23%	17
Accountability Panel	16%	6	24%	18
Participant Initiated	13%	3	5%	4
Arrest	4%	1	1%	1
Agency Initiated	NA	NA	11%	8
Other	NA	NA	4%	3
Law Enforcement Officer Contacts				
Traffic	9%	2	17%	13
Domestic Violence	4%	1	3%	2
Victim	0	0	3%	2
Drugs/DUI	0	0	NA	NA
Misdemeanor	NA	NA	24%	18
Parole Violation	NA	NA	16%	12
Felony	NA	NA	7%	5
Other	0	0	21%	16
Type of Arrest Warrant				
Parole Violation	0	0	7%	5
County	0	0	5%	4

* Table includes two deceased participants enrolled in the Shawnee County program, who died after release from prison. These individuals did participate in some post-release services, so they are included in this table.

Program Outcomes

Recidivism

The KDOC provided data on new charges, new violations and new admissions to prison, recorded at 6 months, 1 year, 18 months, and 2 years post-release, for all program participants, as of July, 2007. Because only two Sedgwick County participants had been released and living in the community for more than six months as of June 30, 2007, recidivism outcomes for the *SgCRP* will be reported in the next annual report. At that time, data on 6, 12, and some 18 month recidivism outcomes should be available.

Other Participant Outcomes

As of July 1, 2007, a total of 23 participants in the Sedgwick County reentry program had been released to the community. While there are too few of these individuals who have been in the community long enough to warrant calculating 6, 12, 18 or 24-month post-release recidivism data, there are a few individuals for whom we can calculate other indicators of their success in the community. Though these data only reflect a small percentage of those released, we present the findings as an indication of the type of analysis that will be pursued in the annual reports to come. More complete data will then yield more significant findings.

After release to the community, 39 percent (n=9) were reported to have acquired a job. Of the nine who secured a job, five did not have a date recorded for the end of that employment, giving the group of employed participants a job retention rate of 56% (5 out of 9).

Only five participants had any information reported regarding their acquisition of housing, or housing changes. For these five participants, there were few changes in housing in the period following release into the community.

Finally, there are three program participants who have (1) been released to the community and (2) have two LSI-R assessments, with the first being in proximity to their start of the reentry program. These tight constraints improve the validity of calculating a score to represent the number of points each participant increased or decreased in LSI-R score over time. All three participants meeting this criteria decreased (improved) their LSI-R score: by 17 points, by 11 points and by 3 points, resulting in a mean decrease of 10 points in LSI-R scores for those who have been released to the community and for whom we have two scores.

Table 7: **Program Outcomes other than Recidivism**

	Sedgwick County
	(n=23) *
Job Attainment	39%
Job Retention (among those employed)	56%
	(n=5)
Mean number of changes in housing	0.8
	(n=3)
Mean change in LSI-R score	-10.0

* As of July 1, 2007, 23 program participants had been released to the community.

Survey Responses

A satisfaction survey is provided to each participant prior to their release from the correctional facility. The participant is given an envelope to send the completed survey to the University of Kansas evaluation staff. Because there is some time delay in receiving the completed surveys, in this section we provide more recent data about the survey responses.

As of January 2008, thirty-two surveys have been completed and returned from the *SgCRP* participants. Their responses indicate a high level of satisfaction with the reentry classes and with the services they were provided while participating in the prison portion of the

program. The participants' responses indicate that 94% of them received release planning case management services. Assistance with substance abuse assessments was reported by 81% of those who completed the surveys.

The survey responses indicate that 28% of those responding believe that the most helpful service received while in prison was case management release planning. Eighty one percent of the respondents reported that the Sedgwick County Reentry staff was available when needed. More than 55 percent of the respondents noted their overall experience with the Reentry program was "excellent", "very good", "good", or "ok".

A satisfaction survey is administered again when the participant completes the community portion of the program. As of this date only two of the *SgCRP* participants have returned a completed community satisfaction survey. The KU evaluation staff recently received approval to implement a revised satisfaction survey that utilizes a Likert rating scale. This revised survey will provide the reentry staff and the evaluation team more specific information about each participant's opinions about the usefulness of individual classes and service interventions and an assessment of his/her overall satisfaction level with the programming received. The revised surveys are being distributed by the Reentry staff at the present time.

Discussion

Several findings from the analysis are worth discussion. First, the *SgCRP* is characterized by a relatively large and skilled staff who has access to and/ or can provide a range of services to reentry participants both in the prison and in the community. The *SgCRP* program is still relatively new, but has been impressive in its steady build-up to its program capacity of 150 participants. There has been very little staff turnover in this program, a fact that has probably contributed to its steady growth.

The relatively low levels of social support that participants identify are of concern, particularly upon release. At the time of their entry into the reentry program, 30 percent of *SgCRP* participants indicated having a significant other. Between program entry and 30 days prior to their release, clearly the level of social support declines when many fewer participants in the *SgCRP* anticipate having social supports upon reintegration to the community. The most common support anticipated was family support, listed only among 14 percent of the participants. At 30 days prior to release, only one percent of participants reported having spousal support in the community. These key indicators of social support may have a bearing on participants' success on various outcome measures, including on housing stability, employment and recidivism markers. Consequently, when a mass of participants has been released for six or more months and complete data are available, we will look at the relationship between these social support indicators and ultimate outcomes.

In addition to social support, approximately 30 days prior to their release participants are also asked or evaluated for the assets they would have at the time of their release. Fewer than one-quarter of program participants reported having any one of the specific assets or supports mentioned (see Table 5). The most common assets secured were a birth certificate (24%) or other form of identification (12%). Having a means of transportation upon release was seldom anticipated by the *SgCRP* program participants. These particular asset areas may require additional focus by program staff in order to optimize participants' supports upon release.

Those participants in the *SgCRP* who are parents have a mean number of two children but there is a very low percentage (14%) of participants identified as owing child support. These data strike us and the *SgCRP* staff as being at odds and so the findings should be taken with some caution until the sources, definitions, and reliability of the data are determined.

In a similar vein, only four percent of *SgCRP* participants admit to having a history of domestic violence charges or victimization. Research has long indicated a strong relationship between the experience and the perpetration of domestic violence and later incarceration. It may be that this history is underreported or is not officially recorded on any of the documents which may serve as sources from which these data are gathered.

In the *SgCRP*, an assessment for substance abuse was the only service used by more than one-half of all participants. An assessment for mental health was also very rarely accomplished. These data seem at odds with the mental health codes assigned them while incarcerated (see Table 1). Most of the population was assigned codes indicating that the participant “may require time-limited MH services” (49%); requires ongoing mental health services and/or medications (14%); requires special needs treatment (18%); or requires reintegration at the Lansing Treatment Unit or Larned Mental Health Correctional Facility (19%).

A relatively small proportion of the *SgCRP* participants completed the housing workshop (15%) and rates for those who started and quit a class were highest for the cognitive thinking class (9%). The *SgCRP* director and staff may want to reevaluate both the content and the benefit of offering certain classes. It may be that the elimination of one could free up staff time to build the curricula of the others which have to do with the fundamental skills and behaviors necessary for successful reintegration.

Conclusion and Next Steps

Not surprisingly, the more participants that enter into the Kansas reentry programs, the more challenging the data collection, analyses and interpretation become. These are good challenges and over time will likely lead to an increase in understanding about what specific interventions are most likely to help offenders successfully reintegrate.

The Kansas Department of Corrections continues to emphasize through its training initiatives the skills required for the productive case management of all inmates who are or will be returning to the community. The data system designed for the reentry program evaluations is capable of supporting the case managers in providing beneficial case management services. On any day a case manager can check the record of any participant and determine, for example, his / her status relative to class enrollment and progress, anticipated and needed social supports, needs for health, mental health, and substance use assessments and interventions, and outcome status. From our bird's-eye view of the reentry programs, we believe that being able to access up-to-date information on a participant's progress is not only great for the case management work to be done but great for building a relationship with an offender; one that says "I am concerned enough about your success to make sure I know what you have accomplished and what you still need to accomplish to make that success a reality." The results of the satisfaction surveys suggest that in fact, the participants want to have exactly that kind of relationship and contact with the case managers.

The ongoing evaluation of all of the KDOC's reentry programs will continue, with a particular emphasis on the relationship between overall program exposure and the ultimate outcomes of violations, new charges and returns to prison at 6, 12, 18, and 24 months post-release. In addition, as the data allow, we will look in detail at exposure to specific program interventions and those ultimate recidivism outcomes, in an effort to help the KDOC to identify and support "what works" in reentry programming.

There are other specific analyses we hope to pursue as well. As a critical mass of women participants builds, we believe it is important to focus some evaluative attention on gender

related outcomes. The correctional literature is building in this area: women offenders respond differently than men to different program structures, content and methods of delivery.

Over time staff will become more comfortable with recording data and we hope to encourage their development in this area by continuing to make the data time-relevant and user friendly. As the consistency, reliability and integrity of the data improve, we hope to be able to connect the LSI-R domain scores with specific interventions, so that case managers and other staff will be able to know with some certainty, the efficacy of a particular intervention. At the same time, more specific information will allow for enhancements in course curricula.

We are working towards operationalizing the case management contacts so that the case manager can document all of the substantive contacts s/he has with a participant and, as part of the evaluation, we can determine which substantive types of contacts have the most beneficial effect. The operationalization of these contacts will take some time, since clear contact definitions are critical to the ultimate integrity of the data.

Similar explorations into the impact of stable housing on offenders' success over time as well as the effect of having / not having certain family and community supports on ultimate outcomes will be accomplished.

Finally, based on the full year data from each of the reentry programs, we are identifying certain variables that will allow us, through the KDOC data system, to secure equivalent comparison groups for each reentry program. We are well aware that the veracity of the findings of these evaluations rest on the ability to present them in comparison to persons with like demographics but who have not had the specific interventions of a formal reentry program. These comparison group analyses will be included in the next annual report.